



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,530	06/15/2006	Rene Pellaux	3024-120	7623
46/02 7590 04/03/2009 JOYCE VON NATZMER PIQUIGNOT + MYERS LLC 200 Madison Avenue Suite 1901 New York, NY 10016				
EXAMINER				
AUDET, MAURY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1654				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/596,530

**Applicant(s)**

PELLAUX ET AL

**Examiner**

MAURY AUDET

**Art Unit**

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 15-19, and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-14, 20-29, and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/23/06

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The present application has been transferred from Examiner Underdal to the present Examiner.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 6-14 and 20-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim, nor can another claim then depend therefrom. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim 32 is objected to because the term “from” in line 1 should be spelled “form”.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 15-19, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In e.g. claim 1, it is unclear what is meant by superabsorptive, in the context of the properties relevant to either a polymer or composite material, and the range which must exist in some overlapping or distinct property each, which confers this effect? A clear definition was not uncovered that fully and distinctly claims the invention's metes and bounds. So lacking, a reasonable understanding of the invention (e.g. structure) could not be ascertained, making

difficult a reasonable search of the art to the boundaries of what is to be included in the invention.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, 15-19, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Przepasniak et al. (US 2005/0131362 A1).

Przepasniak et al. teach a polymerized acrylate for its absorbent properties (see entire document, especially para's 64 and 68):

[0064] The absorbent binder composition also includes about 0.1 to about 75% by mass polyolefin glycol and/or polyolefin oxide units, suitably about 5 to about 75% by mass, particularly about 10 to about 60% by mass, particularly about 20 to about 50% by mass, particularly about 30 to about 40% by mass. The polyolefin glycol or oxide may be a glycol or oxide of an olefin polymer having about 2 to about 4 carbon atoms. The polyolefin glycol and/or oxide may be graft polymerized with the acrylate or methacrylate ester to form a graft

Art Unit: 1654

copolymer. The polyolefin glycol and/or oxide may be a homopolymer or copolymer. The polyolefin glycol and/or oxide may be a block copolymer including olefin glycol or oxide units having different numbers of carbon atoms, for instance, block copolymers of ethylene oxide and propylene oxide. The polyolefin glycol and/or oxide provides the absorbent binder composition with enhanced flexibility. Thus, the absorbent binder composition has enhanced adhesion in a wet condition, absorbency, and flexibility.

[0068] The polyolefin glycol and/or oxide may or may not be graft polymerized onto the acrylate or methacrylate units during the polymerization process. The resulting absorbent binder composition may contain the polyolefin glycol and/or oxide as a separate component, or as part of the copolymer, or a combination of both.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to select polymerized acrylate as an absorbent for a composition, make the same and use it as needed for absorbing e.g. a sample in Przepasniak et al., because the latter teach polymerized acrylate as a preferred molecule for an absorbent composition and the method of making and/or using it for such properties would have been merely a matter of routine optimization by one of ordinary skill in the art in the absorbency arts/or in need thereof.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MAURY AUDET whose telephone number is (571)272-0960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7AM-5:30PM (10 Hrs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MA, 3/28/09

/Maury Audet/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1654